

## **5.10 SOCIOECONOMICS**

This section describes the socioeconomic circumstances of the area potentially affected by the proposed project, and includes a discussion of the potential socioeconomic impacts caused by the demolition, construction, and operation of the proposed project. Also included in this section are LORS and agency contacts applicable to socioeconomics, proposed mitigation measures, and a discussion of permits required for the project.

### **5.10.1 Affected Environment**

#### **5.10.1.1 Study Area**

This section describes the location and economic and demographic characteristics of the study area, including population, employment and economy, local government finance, housing, public services and utilities, and schools.

The project site is located in the City of El Segundo (City), which is located in western Los Angeles County in southern California, in an area also referred to as the “South Bay”. This region developed after the days of the ranchos, when land was primarily used for grazing. Eventually, the beach cities became tourist locations and have retained this tourist focus due to climate and proximity to the ocean. The South Bay as a region is heavily reliant on aerospace and related industries and has two major transportation centers: Los Angeles International Airport, and the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.

In 1911, Standard Oil Co. (now Chevron) selected El Segundo as the site for its second California oil refinery. El Segundo was incorporated as a City in 1917. The Air Force and several aerospace corporations moved to the City in 1960 and further enhanced the City’s reputation as “The Aerospace Capital of the World” (City of El Segundo, 2000).

The socioeconomic study area for this project includes the cities of El Segundo and Manhattan Beach, and the Community of Playa Del Rey (a Community within the City of Los Angeles). Manhattan Beach is located south of the project site, and Playa Del Rey is located north of the project site. Los Angeles County is also included in the study area since construction and operations workers could be drawn from this area. The environmental justice analysis evaluates issues of demographics and poverty for several other cities falling within six miles.

According to the Electric Power Research Institute’s report titled “Socioeconomic Impacts of Power Plants,” construction workers will commute as much as two hours to construction sites from their homes, rather than relocate. Similarly, operations workers will commute as much as one hour to the plant site from their homes. Although Orange and Ventura counties are within a one to two hour commute distance and are potential sources of labor for the project,

they were excluded from further assessment since Los Angeles County has a sufficient labor pool.

#### 5.10.1.2 **Population**

Recent population figures and projected population estimates for Los Angeles County, and the cities of El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, and Playa Del Rey are summarized in Table 5.10-1 and on Figure 5.10-1. Los Angeles County is a densely populated, highly diverse urban region and has the largest population (9.8 million as of January 1999) of any county in the nation. The County experienced steady population growth between 1980 and 1999, and population increases are expected to continue in the future (ENSR, 2000).

**TABLE 5.10-1**  
**HISTORICAL AND PROJECTED POPULATIONS**

Area	Year				
	1980 <sup>1</sup>	1990 <sup>2</sup>	1999 <sup>3</sup>	2010 <sup>2</sup>	2020 <sup>2</sup>
Los Angeles County	7,477,421	8,901,987	9,757,500	10,604,452	11,575,693
City of El Segundo	13,750	15,223	16,600	18,610 <sup>4</sup>	NA
City of Manhattan Beach	31,350	32,063	35,200	NA	NA
Playa Del Rey	NA	11,492	11,548	NA	NA

<sup>1</sup> Historical Population Figures from California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, Report 84 E-4, Population Estimates for California Counties and Cities: 1970-1980.

<sup>2</sup> Historical and Projected Population Figures from California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, County Population Projection with Race/Ethnic Detail, Estimated July 1, 1990-1996 and Projections from 1997 through 2040

<sup>3</sup> 1999 Estimate as of January 1, 1999. California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit City/County Population Estimates, with Annual Percent Change, January 1, 1998 and 1999.

<sup>4</sup> City of El Segundo General Plan, 1992.

<sup>5</sup> NA Data Not Available.

Population growth in El Segundo appears to be stabilizing and according to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) the City will grow by an average of 0.96 percent per year for the 20-year period between 1990 and 2010 (City of El Segundo, 1992). Population projections were not available for the Manhattan Beach and Playa Del Rey areas. Refer to Section 5.10-2 for a discussion of employment, and Table 5.10-6 for the ethnic profile of the area.

### 5.10.1.3 Employment and Economy

The economy of the Los Angeles study area is primarily urban, with the majority of earnings generated in the service, retail, manufacturing, and government industries. Table 5.10-2 shows the importance of industries in terms of personal income earnings they generate. Services and manufacturing are important industries, accounting for over 50 percent of earnings. Construction employment represents approximately 3.5 percent of total employment earnings in the study area, concentrated primarily around residential and commercial development.

**TABLE 5.10-2**  
**LOS ANGELES COUNTY NON-FARM EARNINGS FOR 1996-1997**  
**(thousands of dollars)**

<b>Industry</b>	<b>Los Angeles</b>	<b>Percent</b>
Services	69,720,311	37.7
Wholesale Trade	12,741,333	6.9
Retail Trade	15,134,083	8.2
Manufacturing	28,928,996	15.6
Government	21,793,746	11.8
Transportation & Public Utilities	13,100,568	7.1
Construction	6,446,561	3.5
Finance, Insurance & Real Estate	16,159,000	8.7
Agriculture	621,876	0.3
Mining	465,141	0.2
Total Non-Farm Earnings	185,111,615	100

Source: ENSR, 2000.

Los Angeles County's civilian labor force is estimated to be 4,658,600, with an unemployment rate of 5.9 percent, slightly higher than the State's unemployment rate of 5.2 percent (California Employment Development Department [EDD], 2000). Labor market conditions in Los Angeles County have been improving steadily over the last five years and are expected to continue to grow. From 1995 to 1999, the civilian labor force in Los Angeles County grew by 309,000 (71 %) and the unemployment rate declined from 7.9 to 5.9 percent.

In 1999, services were the dominant industry in the County, and accounted for almost 33 percent of all employment with one fourth of the jobs in the business sector (EDD, County Snapshot, 2000). Manufacturing made up 16 percent, retail trade accounted for over 15 percent of the total, and restaurants provided for almost 38 percent of the jobs in retail

trade. Construction and mining made up 3.2 percent of the employment percent (EDD, 2000).

By 2002, the total number of non-farm wage and salary jobs is expected to increase by 13 percent in Los Angeles County. Employment gains are anticipated across all major industry divisions except mining, the region's smallest industry. The services industry division is expected to add the greatest number of jobs. As of June 1999, the County had a construction workforce of 64,000 (ENSR, 2000). Between 1997-2004, an additional 5,380 jobs will be added to the construction workforce sector (EDD, County Snapshot, 2000).

In September 2000, El Segundo had a labor force of 10,250, of which 10,000 persons were employed. The City had an unemployment rate of 2.5 percent. Manhattan Beach had a labor force of 22,520, of which 22,130 persons were employed. The City of Manhattan's unemployment rate is 1.7 percent (EDD, 2000).

The estimated 1996 median family income for Los Angeles was \$46,900. The estimated 2000 median family income for El Segundo is \$55,361; \$80,223 for Manhattan Beach; and \$62,896 for Playa Del Rey (CACI Marketing Systems, 2000).

#### **5.10.1.4 Housing**

As of January 2000, there were approximately 3.7 million housing units in Los Angeles County, 7,362 units in El Segundo, and 15,293 units in the City of Manhattan Beach (California State Department of Finance, Table 2, 2000). These totals include single-family, multi-family, and mobile home residences. The County had a vacancy rate of 5.51 percent, El Segundo had a vacancy rate of 5.79 percent, and Manhattan Beach had a vacancy rate of 4.78 percent.

These vacancy rates, with the exception of the City of Manhattan Beach, are above the federal housing standard of five percent. According to the federal housing standard, an area with vacancy rates above five percent is not considered to be in short supply of housing.

In addition to owner-occupied and rental housing, there are a number of motel/hotel accommodations and recreational vehicle sites throughout the study area. The City of El Segundo has six hotels, for a total of approximately 2,200 hotel/motel rooms. Occupancy rates in the City of El Segundo range from 85 to 90 percent throughout the year. The main occupancy peak times are during Monday through Friday, due to the extensive number of business travelers staying in El Segundo area hotels. The occupancy rate is fairly constant throughout the year with a slight increase in occupancy during the summer months due to tourists (Hanson, 2000). The City of Manhattan Beach has a total of 10 hotels and motels. The total number of hotel/motel rooms is 866. The occupancy peak times are during the summer months.

**5.10.1.5 Schools**

Enrollment data for both the Los Angeles and El Segundo Unified School Districts were compiled for this assessment. A sufficient labor pool exists within the study area and it is anticipated that construction and operations workers are expected to commute to the project site rather than relocate. Therefore, no impacts to schools are expected from the project. Nonetheless, the enrollment data for both the Los Angeles and El Segundo Unified School Districts are presented in Tables 5.10-3 and 5.10-4.

**TABLE 5.10-3**

**LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (LAUSD)  
ENROLLMENT INFORMATION  
(October 1999)**

<b>Schools**</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>
Elementary	424	363,029
Middle	72	139,249
Senior High	49	151,030
Magnet Schools & Centers	150	47,845
Special Education Schools	19	4,437
Opportunity and Continuation Schools	62	5,597
<b>Total Enrollment</b>		<b>711,187</b>

Source: LAUSD website, 2000.

\*\* Number of schools and centers as of July, 2000.

**TABLE 5.10-4**

**EL SEGUNDO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT  
ENROLLMENT INFORMATION  
(October, 1999)**

<b>Schools</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Enrollment</b>
Elementary	2	1178
Middle	1	679
Senior High	1	997
Continuation Schools	1	40
<b>Total Enrollment</b>		<b>2,894</b>

Source: City of El Segundo, 2000.

**5.10.1.6 Utilities**

Electricity for the project site will be provided by SCE. The ESGS currently receives natural gas from the Southern California Gas Company (SoCalGas). SoCalGas will continue to provide gas to the plant through an existing 20-inch pipeline.

Sanitary wastes from the proposed and existing plant will be discharge via a new pipeline to the municipal sanitary sewer that is operated by the City of Manhattan Beach. The average wastewater discharge is expected to be approximately 750 gallons per day from the proposed and existing units.

Water will be supplied from three sources: potable water from the City of El Segundo, reclaimed water from the West Basin Municipal Water District, and Santa Monica seawater from the existing intake structure currently serving the plant site. There is adequate water to make up the water supply to meet the daily demands of the project. In addition, a back-up water source will be supplied from the City of Manhattan Beach potable water system.

Non-hazardous solid waste from the project will be recycled, deposited in a Class III landfill, or handled in some other environmentally safe manner. There are several Class III landfills located in Los Angeles, Ventura and San Bernardino County. The available capacities of some of these landfills are summarized in Table 5.15-1. As indicated in the table, landfills in the project site area have adequate recycling and disposal capacities.

**5.10.1.7 Emergency and Other Services**

The project site is served by the City of El Segundo Fire Department, which includes 54 firefighters and paramedics operating out of two fire stations (City of El Segundo Fire Department, 2000). The closest station to the project site is Station 1, located approximately 1.5 miles northeast of the project site. Station 1 typically has 10 firefighters and paramedic staff on duty per shift. The fire response time to the project site is estimated to be approximately 3 to 5 minutes (Sharp, 2000). Station 2 is located approximately 3 miles due east of the project site. If additional resources are needed the project site can also be served by the fire stations of the City of Manhattan Beach Fire Department which includes 31 full-time firefighters and paramedics and 30 part time fire fighters (City of Manhattan Beach Fire Department, 2000). The response time to the project site from City of Manhattan Beach Fire Station 1 is approximately 3 to 4 minutes, while the response time from City of Manhattan Beach Fire Station 2 is approximately 5 minutes (Shuck, 2000).

The El Segundo Police Department provides law enforcement services to the project site and vicinity. The El Segundo Police Department currently has 63 full-time officers. The police department is located approximately 1 mile northeast of the project site and the response time

to the project site is approximately 1 minute (Harrington, 2000). If needed, additional law enforcement resources can be provided by the Manhattan Beach Police Department, which employs 60-70 full time police officers and has a response time to the project site of approximately 2 to 3 minutes (Chapman, 2000).

The Robert F. Kennedy Medical Center is equipped for handling emergency services. The hospital is located four miles northwest of the project site. Other hospitals/medical facilities within a 10-mile radius of the project site include: Daniel Freeman Marina Hospital, located approximately 5 miles north; Little Company of Mary Hospital, located 6 miles southeast; Hawthorne Hospital, located approximately 4.5 miles east; Torrance Memorial Medical Center, located approximately 7 miles southeast; and Los Angeles County Harbor - UCLA Medical Center, located approximately 10 miles southeast.

#### **5.10.1.8 Local Government Finance**

For fiscal year of 1999-2000, the total adopted budget for the City of El Segundo was \$73,041,300. The projected budget for FY 2000-2001 is \$72,126,750. The City of El Segundo currently receives one percent of the State's 8.25 percent sales tax. The following table (Table 5.10-5) generally represents distribution of revenues in the City.

**TABLE 5.10-5**

#### **GENERAL TAX LEVY SHARE WITHIN CITY OF EL SEGUNDO**

<b>Fiscal Year 1997 —1998</b>	<b>Adjusted %</b>
Schools	47.7
County Library	0.8
Redevelopment Agencies	18.1
Cities	9.1
Special District	12.4
County Government	11.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Source: City of El Segundo, Finance Department.

Property taxes are assessed by the Los Angeles County Assessor's Office according to the California Revenue and Taxation Code, which includes Proposition 13. Any resulting revenues are distributed to special districts within the County.

#### **5.10.1.9 Environmental Justice**

According to the federal guidelines, the environmental justice screening analysis assesses whether "the potentially affected community includes minority and/or low income

populations.” The guidelines indicate that a minority population exists when the minority population is 50 percent of affected area’s total population. The 50 percent threshold is also used to determine the presence of low-income populations in the study area.

**Field Survey.** A field survey was conducted on December 1 and 5, 2000 to determine the locations of low-income or minority residential areas within a six mile radius of the ESGS. The cities and communities included: El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, Playa del Rey, Hermosa Beach, Redondo Beach, Del Aire, Westchester, Torrance, Lawndale, Marina del Rey, Gardena, El Camino Village, Gardena, Hawthorne, Lennox, Inglewood, Fox Hills, Culver City, Ladera Heights, and areas of the City of Los Angeles. Figure 5.10-1 identifies the census tracts, cities and communities within a six-mile radius of the ESGS site.

In preparation of the field survey, the 1990 United States Census (Census) Data as well as 2000 Populations Estimates for the survey area were reviewed. Once the six-mile radius was identified, a grid pattern was established to effectively cover the area. The grid pattern followed the larger streets with each grid varying in size from 0.25 to 0.50 miles in all directions depending on the orientation of the streets and highways.

The region was driven using the established grid pattern. In addition, neighborhoods along the smaller residential streets were surveyed to clarify the existence of low-income and minority neighborhoods. Low-income residential areas were determined through the review of 2000 Demographic Data for each census tract. Refer to Table 5.10-6 for low-income information by census tracts for the six-mile study area. Low-income areas identified from the 2000 Demographics Data were not surveyed since it is assumed that the data is correct. Only areas that indicated an absence of low-income areas were driven to identify any pockets of low-income populations that might be present. These areas were identified by observing the high percentage of structures in disrepair. Refer to Figure 5.10-2, Low Income Populations Identified within the Six-Mile Study Area, for the location of these areas.

Areas of minority populations were determined through the review of 2000 Demographic Data for each census tract. Refer to Table 5.10-6 for information on race by census tract population for the six-mile study area. These neighborhoods were identified by the ethnic population found in the area. Refer to Figure 5.10-3, Minority Populations Identified within the Six-Mile Study Area, for the location of these areas.



**TABLE 5.10-6**

**NUMBER OF PEOPLE BY RACE AND POVERTY LEVEL WITHIN A SIX-MILE RADIUS OF PLANT SITE**

<b>Geography Label and Census Tract Number</b>	<b>2000 Population Estimate</b>	<b>1990 Census</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Other Races</b>	<b>Hispanic Origin<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Population Below Poverty Level</b>	<b>2000 Est. Median Household Income</b>
CTY 06037 TRACT 2739.00	4,400	4,525	86.50%	4.70%	3.80%	5.00%	10.07%	5.91%	\$59,555.14
CTY 06037 TRACT 2741.00	1,732	1,523	70.90%	2.02%	11.55%	15.53%	26.27%	2.02%	\$76,179.25
CTY 06037 TRACT 2742.00	7,426	6,118	89.48%	3.51%	4.66%	2.34%	7.10%	6.21%	\$66,068.84
CTY 06037 TRACT 2752.00	4,581	3,783	50.49%	5.52%	12.86%	31.13%	52.19%	9.88%	\$46,097.97
CTY 06037 TRACT 2753.02	4,780	3,992	73.26%	2.57%	18.16%	6.00%	11.13%	2.89%	\$78,387.53
CTY 06037 TRACT 2753.11	5,973	5,316	47.98%	3.58%	30.77%	17.66%	31.29%	5.71%	\$52,848.40
CTY 06037 TRACT 2753.12	285	239	67.02%	12.98%	12.63%	7.37%	20.70%	14.56%	\$39,736.84
CTY 06037 TRACT 2754.00	2,332	2,180	68.05%	0.69%	15.18%	16.08%	31.56%	5.04%	\$60,359.12
CTY 06037 TRACT 2755.00	6,226	5,916	22.23%	15.64%	22.33%	39.80%	54.08%	31.25%	\$29,944.75
CTY 06037 TRACT 2756.00	3,508	3,367	42.70%	3.71%	29.56%	24.03%	36.26%	7.20%	\$39,469.70
CTY 06037 TRACT 2760.00	5,502	5,266	83.64%	1.44%	11.16%	3.76%	11.21%	2.56%	\$71,847.05
CTY 06037 TRACT 2761.00	4,529	3,440	54.16%	31.64%	8.32%	5.87%	12.94%	7.34%	\$38,335.25
CTY 06037 TRACT 2764.00	3,724	3,728	86.06%	0.64%	11.09%	2.20%	11.31%	1.99%	\$83,235.98
CTY 06037 TRACT 2765.00	3,868	4,294	74.22%	10.11%	12.87%	2.79%	8.30%	6.29%	\$56,551.20
CTY 06037 TRACT 2766.01	3,547	3,408	84.66%	2.34%	9.53%	3.47%	10.88%	4.21%	\$86,255.19
CTY 06037 TRACT 2766.02	8,484	7,527	83.62%	4.37%	8.51%	3.50%	8.29%	3.68%	\$61,743.52
CTY 06037 TRACT 2770.00	5,415	5,006	86.22%	1.39%	9.73%	2.66%	10.03%	0.80%	\$76,651.65
CTY 06037 TRACT 2771.00	3,267	2,947	80.29%	1.78%	12.15%	5.79%	18.21%	5.47%	\$68,873.52
CTY 06037 TRACT 2772.00	3,421	3,400	47.53%	13.91%	10.67%	27.89%	47.12%	11.24%	\$33,196.20
CTY 06037 TRACT 2774.00	4,367	3,591	37.49%	26.49%	13.85%	22.17%	31.44%	7.83%	\$37,116.25
CTY 06037 TRACT 2780.00	2,838	2,428	75.12%	4.83%	11.45%	8.60%	18.92%	7.23%	\$56,160.46
CTY 06037 TRACT 2781.00	4,093	2,968	90.13%	2.42%	5.64%	1.81%	7.53%	9.26%	\$74,048.22
CTY 06037 TRACT 6005.01	3,010	2,657	3.82%	92.86%	0.73%	2.59%	5.65%	4.70%	\$54,629.63
CTY 06037 TRACT 6005.02	2,162	2,217	8.00%	69.75%	1.99%	20.26%	31.91%	5.21%	\$66,625.00
CTY 06037 TRACT 6006.01	2,755	2,747	2.40%	93.76%	0.54%	3.30%	3.48%	9.92%	\$56,573.28
CTY 06037 TRACT 6006.02	3,403	3,372	10.73%	43.49%	0.56%	45.22%	65.15%	28.83%	\$24,127.36
CTY 06037 TRACT 6007.01	5,391	4,992	10.83%	85.10%	1.45%	2.62%	3.38%	7.78%	\$47,724.94
CTY 06037 TRACT 6007.02	3,592	3,314	3.42%	84.77%	1.64%	10.16%	10.27%	11.53%	\$73,926.77
CTY 06037 TRACT 6009.02	7,315	6,452	8.97%	55.37%	1.54%	34.12%	46.44%	16.72%	\$28,922.50
CTY 06037 TRACT 6010.01	2,341	2,194	22.13%	68.30%	6.79%	2.78%	4.14%	15.33%	\$19,548.39
CTY 06037 TRACT 6010.02	5,638	4,873	8.99%	51.99%	1.95%	37.07%	50.57%	12.05%	\$32,855.23
CTY 06037 TRACT 6011.00	6,267	6,339	9.81%	41.30%	1.13%	47.76%	64.00%	17.02%	\$29,572.54

**TABLE 5.10-6  
(CONTINUED)**

<b>Geography Label and Census Tract Number</b>	<b>2000 Population Estimate</b>	<b>1990 Census</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Other Races</b>	<b>Hispanic Origin<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Population Below Poverty Level</b>	<b>2000 Est. Median Household Income</b>
CTY 06037 TRACT 6012.02	3,834	3,370	21.44%	13.95%	2.06%	62.55%	86.52%	12.54%	\$48,345.07
CTY 06037 TRACT 6012.11	2,737	2,631	14.10%	49.76%	1.32%	34.82%	49.69%	13.61%	\$30,877.19
CTY 06037 TRACT 6012.12	6,775	6,088	11.04%	32.84%	2.64%	53.48%	71.10%	19.16%	\$30,894.31
CTY 06037 TRACT 6013.01	2,207	1,950	40.10%	45.94%	6.84%	7.11%	15.41%	2.63%	\$55,203.35
CTY 06037 TRACT 6013.02	7,388	6,905	6.81%	71.05%	0.88%	21.26%	28.74%	13.19%	\$36,343.69
CTY 06037 TRACT 6013.03	4,974	4,632	4.58%	72.22%	1.37%	21.83%	28.71%	9.97%	\$30,807.96
CTY 06037 TRACT 6014.01	5,611	5,865	22.53%	28.41%	5.45%	43.61%	67.03%	13.70%	\$40,800.00
CTY 06037 TRACT 6014.02	6,384	5,121	26.07%	10.23%	3.78%	59.93%	88.85%	11.46%	\$43,690.88
CTY 06037 TRACT 6015.00	7,492	8,112	55.26%	5.43%	1.48%	37.83%	95.50%	16.22%	\$33,784.19
CTY 06037 TRACT 6016.00	4,398	4,733	39.25%	4.59%	3.02%	53.14%	93.63%	23.35%	\$43,101.42
CTY 06037 TRACT 6017.00	5,841	6,378	21.02%	6.16%	0.86%	71.96%	94.08%	27.75%	\$31,465.52
CTY 06037 TRACT 6018.00	8,605	8,175	23.71%	5.46%	2.55%	68.29%	95.56%	24.72%	\$39,573.64
CTY 06037 TRACT 6019.00	6,787	7,489	13.58%	20.02%	2.08%	64.31%	87.03%	22.71%	\$35,155.17
CTY 06037 TRACT 6020.01	9,296	8,045	15.29%	34.17%	0.52%	50.03%	74.84%	14.68%	\$40,446.99
CTY 06037 TRACT 6020.02	2,557	2,527	23.31%	22.45%	7.31%	46.93%	72.19%	22.36%	\$34,117.65
CTY 06037 TRACT 6021.01	6,607	9,310	19.10%	30.51%	12.06%	38.32%	56.09%	15.49%	\$38,668.92
CTY 06037 TRACT 6021.02	12,184	8,236	34.69%	23.34%	14.89%	27.08%	46.41%	10.21%	\$34,377.49
CTY 06037 TRACT 6022.00	6,282	5,334	61.45%	11.22%	10.06%	17.27%	43.46%	7.72%	\$47,510.85
CTY 06037 TRACT 6023.01	6,212	5,519	68.16%	2.96%	12.69%	16.19%	35.05%	5.77%	\$53,363.14
CTY 06037 TRACT 6023.02	2,878	3,208	81.69%	0.94%	10.18%	7.19%	18.31%	2.25%	\$80,589.43
CTY 06037 TRACT 6024.01	10,532	9,409	33.74%	19.89%	20.77%	25.60%	41.35%	10.63%	\$43,145.40
CTY 06037 TRACT 6024.02	6,466	5,869	56.76%	7.87%	16.07%	19.30%	36.20%	6.88%	\$57,995.50
CTY 06037 TRACT 6025.01	10,067	8,913	23.19%	31.46%	15.71%	29.63%	43.06%	9.82%	\$34,716.98
CTY 06037 TRACT 6025.02	8,444	7,429	28.60%	41.97%	13.12%	16.31%	25.04%	11.89%	\$31,422.31
CTY 06037 TRACT 6025.03	8,245	7,211	18.33%	48.39%	14.85%	18.44%	26.49%	15.41%	\$29,910.22
CTY 06037 TRACT 6026.00	8,313	8,376	5.34%	82.76%	5.20%	6.70%	11.28%	6.40%	\$55,900.00
CTY 06037 TRACT 6027.00	3,630	3,064	3.42%	89.37%	0.03%	7.19%	10.39%	8.21%	\$74,786.93
CTY 06037 TRACT 6029.00	4,069	3,913	27.80%	22.19%	11.28%	38.73%	66.11%	11.82%	\$40,124.05
CTY 06037 TRACT 6034.00	4,212	4,076	38.32%	8.97%	44.59%	8.12%	23.05%	5.98%	\$49,098.94
CTY 06037 TRACT 6035.00	3,899	3,457	46.27%	6.13%	33.03%	14.57%	33.34%	5.77%	\$48,436.17
CTY 06037 TRACT 6036.00	3,639	3,223	57.76%	2.47%	30.89%	8.88%	23.39%	1.97%	\$57,893.12
CTY 06037 TRACT 6037.01	9,064	8,405	30.17%	25.30%	18.50%	26.03%	39.55%	13.80%	\$43,017.24
CTY 06037 TRACT 6037.02	4,984	4,589	68.58%	2.81%	23.94%	4.67%	14.77%	4.44%	\$66,209.48
CTY 06037 TRACT 6038.00	8,283	7,311	48.69%	13.33%	20.00%	17.98%	36.63%	15.34%	\$45,509.07
CTY 06037 TRACT 6039.00	6,801	6,400	51.02%	7.10%	15.00%	26.88%	44.52%	9.42%	\$50,540.66

**TABLE 5.10-6  
(CONTINUED)**

<b>Geography Label and Census Tract Number</b>	<b>2000 Population Estimate</b>	<b>1990 Census</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Other Races</b>	<b>Hispanic Origin<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Population Below Poverty Level</b>	<b>2000 Est. Median Household Income</b>
CTY 06037 TRACT 6040.00	9,145	7,982	54.77%	6.33%	11.77%	27.13%	39.78%	8.98%	\$45,107.08
CTY 06037 TRACT 6041.00	5,696	5,645	56.23%	6.81%	15.43%	21.52%	43.40%	7.09%	\$46,725.35
CTY 06037 TRACT 6200.00	7,227	6,799	88.47%	0.64%	6.43%	4.46%	10.85%	4.98%	\$67,657.46
CTY 06037 TRACT 6200.99	0	1	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	\$0.00
CTY 06037 TRACT 6201.00	9,033	8,426	87.40%	1.41%	7.03%	4.16%	11.23%	3.30%	\$63,605.53
CTY 06037 TRACT 6202.00	1,431	1,281	94.48%	0.91%	3.42%	1.19%	6.29%	5.55%	\$75,617.28
CTY 06037 TRACT 6203.01	4,308	3,932	94.36%	0.42%	3.64%	1.58%	5.99%	3.54%	\$122,547.17
CTY 06037 TRACT 6203.02	6,462	6,101	94.24%	0.68%	3.47%	1.61%	5.90%	3.20%	\$98,652.22
CTY 06037 TRACT 6203.03	4,285	4,087	93.37%	0.26%	4.99%	1.38%	5.51%	0.56%	\$128,497.02
CTY 06037 TRACT 6204.00	5,088	4,626	88.64%	0.92%	8.75%	1.69%	7.35%	1.99%	\$114,879.65
CTY 06037 TRACT 6205.01	5,478	5,088	85.76%	1.22%	9.73%	3.29%	10.62%	4.96%	\$78,763.74
CTY 06037 TRACT 6205.21	3,739	3,554	82.86%	3.42%	7.25%	6.47%	18.67%	6.67%	\$70,715.30
CTY 06037 TRACT 6205.22	4,125	3,804	83.44%	2.01%	10.21%	4.34%	11.54%	7.15%	\$76,260.96
CTY 06037 TRACT 6206.01	5,391	4,599	77.94%	2.19%	9.74%	10.13%	21.54%	7.48%	\$61,420.68
CTY 06037 TRACT 6206.02	5,521	4,943	83.21%	1.45%	10.12%	5.22%	15.27%	3.48%	\$77,954.55
CTY 06037 TRACT 6207.01	6,188	5,858	82.89%	1.91%	10.41%	4.80%	10.50%	2.85%	\$91,234.11
CTY 06037 TRACT 6207.02	6,955	6,118	82.26%	1.28%	12.01%	4.46%	9.43%	4.34%	\$113,698.14
CTY 06037 TRACT 6208.00	7,171	6,763	85.90%	0.99%	10.24%	2.87%	7.91%	2.29%	\$86,817.41
CTY 06037 TRACT 6209.01	2,510	2,385	94.02%	0.64%	3.94%	1.39%	5.82%	5.64%	\$127,793.30
CTY 06037 TRACT 6209.02	3,259	2,885	95.86%	0.21%	2.73%	1.20%	4.30%	4.39%	\$110,073.26
CTY 06037 TRACT 6210.01	3,913	3,890	87.94%	1.71%	5.93%	4.42%	9.17%	4.40%	\$84,285.71
CTY 06037 TRACT 6210.02	5,409	5,585	93.62%	1.15%	3.48%	1.76%	6.82%	4.67%	\$88,516.26
CTY 06037 TRACT 6211.00	9,566	8,744	90.34%	1.16%	5.52%	2.98%	8.68%	2.63%	\$80,911.64
CTY 06037 TRACT 6212.01	6,406	5,687	86.58%	1.70%	7.35%	4.37%	10.21%	3.13%	\$83,216.43
CTY 06037 TRACT 6212.02	3,553	3,444	84.91%	2.59%	8.42%	4.08%	8.53%	5.83%	\$59,279.48
CTY 06037 TRACT 6213.01	6,542	6,128	84.52%	1.74%	8.71%	5.03%	12.96%	4.25%	\$80,852.06
CTY 06037 TRACT 6213.21	3,887	3,505	87.57%	1.75%	6.12%	4.55%	13.48%	3.12%	\$68,852.04
CTY 06037 TRACT 6213.22	3,147	3,341	91.55%	1.21%	5.12%	2.13%	8.87%	5.80%	\$63,477.80
CTY 06037 TRACT 6214.00	4,301	4,098	88.84%	0.47%	7.37%	3.32%	9.67%	3.28%	\$71,619.90
CTY 06037 TRACT 6500.01	6,372	5,835	46.56%	1.22%	48.09%	4.13%	14.94%	7.39%	\$63,888.89
CTY 06037 TRACT 6500.02	6,762	6,526	56.29%	3.74%	33.23%	6.74%	16.27%	6.21%	\$48,387.37
CTY 06037 TRACT 6501.02	2,497	2,190	62.03%	1.00%	32.68%	4.29%	10.77%	4.04%	\$65,951.49
CTY 06037 TRACT 6502.00	5,915	5,437	66.51%	1.56%	26.73%	5.21%	14.10%	3.35%	\$77,646.75
CTY 06037 TRACT 6503.00	6,535	5,871	64.25%	2.05%	25.31%	8.39%	19.22%	5.20%	\$57,342.95
CTY 06037 TRACT 6504.00	4,211	3,902	71.05%	0.59%	24.91%	3.44%	11.28%	3.08%	\$74,720.15

**TABLE 5.10-6  
(CONTINUED)**

<b>Geography Label and Census Tract Number</b>	<b>2000 Population Estimate</b>	<b>1990 Census</b>	<b>White</b>	<b>Black</b>	<b>Asian &amp; Pacific Islander</b>	<b>Other Races</b>	<b>Hispanic Origin<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Percent of Population Below Poverty Level</b>	<b>2000 Est. Median Household Income</b>
CTY 06037 TRACT 6505.01	3,112	3,093	72.94%	0.22%	23.33%	3.50%	9.54%	3.75%	\$76,124.34
CTY 06037 TRACT 6505.02	3,986	4,324	72.48%	0.60%	24.59%	2.33%	7.35%	1.81%	\$89,928.06
CTY 06037 TRACT 6506.01	7,671	7,180	65.70%	3.53%	25.52%	5.24%	13.00%	4.25%	\$45,935.25
CTY 06037 TRACT 6506.02	7,509	6,664	59.05%	1.84%	35.22%	3.89%	10.87%	5.94%	\$55,361.31
CTY 06037 TRACT 6506.03	3,859	3,198	66.93%	0.16%	31.64%	1.27%	3.55%	5.00%	\$81,770.83
CTY 06037 TRACT 6507.01	2,078	2,142	74.98%	0.77%	22.47%	1.78%	10.44%	1.66%	\$85,057.47
CTY 06037 TRACT 6507.02	4,722	4,548	71.50%	0.23%	24.76%	3.52%	9.15%	1.28%	\$83,016.30
CTY 06037 TRACT 7026.00	6,324	6,280	70.30%	4.32%	18.36%	7.02%	16.87%	4.07%	\$72,353.25
CTY 06037 TRACT 7028.03	3,166	3,017	69.71%	3.47%	11.62%	15.19%	47.16%	9.52%	\$58,318.66
CTY 06037 TRACT 7029.00	8,171	7,431	87.54%	4.39%	6.13%	1.93%	5.16%	4.09%	\$64,814.13
CTY 06037 TRACT 7029.99	0	0	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00	\$0.00
CTY 06037 TRACT 7030.01	5,623	5,110	50.29%	36.16%	8.38%	5.18%	11.45%	3.56%	\$53,213.88
CTY 06037 TRACT 7030.02	6,937	6,673	31.96%	60.13%	5.35%	2.57%	5.23%	2.86%	\$74,668.73

Source: Demographic Report, Claritas Inc., 2000.

<sup>1</sup>. It should be noted that the Bureau of Census indicates that persons of Hispanic origin may identify with any of the minority population categories listed above, as well as with White and any other category, to capture undefined origins.

The survey was a qualitative analysis and did not reflect every street and/or residence within a certain boundary. Streets and/or residential areas of higher income level may have occurred within the boundaries presented in this field survey.

**Observations/Boundaries.** The following presents observations made during the field surveys dated December 1 and 5, 2000. The observations are separated into low-income and minority status.

**Low Income Areas.** In order to compare the economic status of the areas presented in this report with field observations, poverty level information was reviewed from the 2000 Demographic Data. Low-income populations are identified as those individuals who have been counted as below the poverty level. For purposed of this analysis, if a census tract's proportion of population below poverty level is greater than that of Los Angeles County as a whole (22.7%), the census tract is considered to be low income.

The following presents observed boundaries of low-income residential area listed by their respective cities and communities from the field surveys. Note that these boundaries are neighborhood boundaries and at times extend into neighboring cities. As stated earlier, these areas do not include low-income areas already identified by the demographic data.

**Inglewood.**

- Areas east and west of Yukon Boulevard between Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway
- Areas east and west of Crenshaw Boulevard between Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway
- West of Van Ness Avenue between Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway
- La Cienega Boulevard between Manchester Boulevard and 98th Place
- Areas east and west of Prairie Avenue between Century Boulevard and Imperial Highway.

2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 3.69 percent – 9.26 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$61,743 and \$86,255.

**El Segundo.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed in the City of El Segundo. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community

ranges between 2.02 percent and 6.21 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$59,555 and 78,388.

**Manhattan Beach.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 0.56 percent and 5.64 and. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$86,817 and \$128,497.

**Playa del Rey.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 3.69 percent and 9.26 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$61,743 and \$86,255.

**Hermosa Beach.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 2.64 percent and 4.67 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$84,286 and \$88,516.

**Redondo Beach.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 1.28 percent and 7.48 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$55,361 and \$113,698.

**Del Aire.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 5.77 percent and 7.71 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$47,511 and \$53,363.

**Westchester.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 poverty level data estimates indicate that the poverty level within this Community is ranges between 2.0 percent and 6.29 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$56,551 and \$83,236.

**Torrance.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 1.81 percent – 7.39 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$45,935 and \$77,647.

**Lawndale.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 6.09 percent and

15.34 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this community is between \$45,107 and \$50,541.

**Marina del Rey.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 poverty level data estimates indicate that the poverty level within this Community is ranges between 2.01 percent and 6.21 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$59,555 and \$78,388.

**Gardena.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 1.98 percent – 11.83 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$40,124 and \$74,786.

**El Camino Village.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 4.44 percent and 13.8 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$43,017 and \$66,209.

**Hawthorne.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 2.26 percent and 22.36 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$29,910 and \$80,589.

**Fox Hills.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this area is 3.56 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is \$53,214.

**Culver City.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this area is 4.07 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is \$72,353.

**Ladera Heights.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 poverty level data estimates indicate that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 2.63 percent and 7.34 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$38,335 and \$74,669.

**City of Los Angeles.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 2.56 percent and 31.25 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$29,945 and 71,847. No distinctively low-income areas were observed other than the areas identified in the demographic data.

**Lennox.** No distinctively low-income areas were observed. 2000 Poverty level data indicates that the poverty level within this Community ranges between 16.22 percent and – 27.75 percent. The 2000 estimated median household income for this Community is between \$31,456 and \$43,101.

**Minority Status Areas.** According to field observations, minority neighborhoods were observed in Inglewood, Hawthorne, Torrance, Lawndale, City of Los Angeles, Fox Hills and Culver City. Refer to Figure 5.10-3 for the location of these areas. No minority neighborhoods were observed within a 2.5-mile radius of the ESGS site.

Based on the CEC guidelines, which states that “a minority population exists when the minority population is 50 percent of an affected area’s total population”, environmental justice issues related to minority populations are not applicable to the project.

## **5.10.2 Impacts (or Environmental Consequences)**

The following sections discuss the effects of project demolition, construction, and operation on the socioeconomic resources of the project area. Potential cumulative impacts and closure/abandonment impacts are also discussed. As outlined in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, project-related impacts are determined to be significant if they induced substantial growth or concentration of population, displaced a large number of people, or disrupted/divided the physical arrangement of an established Community. The following discussion includes impact analysis for the plant site and pipelines.

### **5.10.2.1 Plant Demolition, Construction, and Operation**

**5.10.2.1.1 Demolition.** Demolition activities would last approximately 4-6 months, and would require approximately 62 workers. The demolition schedule is based on a double-shift, 7-day workweek. It is anticipated that most of the construction personnel would be drawn from communities in Los Angeles County and that workers would not be expected to relocate. Based on the information summarized in Tables 5.10-7 and 5.10-8, there are enough construction workers/laborers available within the County to meet the demands of project construction. Therefore, it is not anticipated that demolition activities would contribute to a significant increase in the population of the project area during the 4-6 month demolition period.



**TABLE 5.10-7****PROJECT LABOR NEEDS AND AVAILABLE LABOR BY CRAFT/SKILL**

<b>Craft</b>	<b>Total Number of Workers in Los Angeles County 1997<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>Total Number of Workers in Los Angeles County Available 2004<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Maximum Number of Workers Needed for the Project<sup>3</sup></b>	<b>Average Number of Workers Needed for the Project</b>	<b>California OES Code<sup>4</sup></b>
Specialized Insulation Workers	140	150	27	9	87802
Boilermakers/ironworkers	29,010	31,640	70	50	89100
Bricklayers/Masons	1,480	1,870	5	2	87302
Carpenters	16,870	20,200	64	26.5	87102
Electricians	11,680	13,570	55	28	87202
Laborers	13,810	16,640	64	32	98300
Millwrights	680	780	16	8	85123
Operating Engineers	6,900	8,190	25	12	95099
Painters	8,350	9,730	7	2	87400
Pipefitters/ Sprinklerfitters	6,950	8,020	111	47	87502
Plasterers	8,350	9,730	26	1	87400
Sheetmetal workers	4,700	5,180	16	6	89132
Surveyors	630	440	11	4	22311
Field Staff	5,130	6,130	53	34	15017
Teamsters	25,040	30,550	8	3	97102

<sup>1</sup> Data from the State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information, Table 6, Occupational Employment Projections 1997 – 2004. Total workers calculated from the 1995 EDD estimated workforce for Los Angeles County. (EDD, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> Data from the State of California, Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information, Table 6, Occupational Employment Projections 1997 – 2004. Total workers calculated from the 1995 EDD estimated workforce for Los Angeles County. (EDD, 2000).

<sup>3</sup> The maximum number of workers by each craft would be needed at different points in time during project construction.

<sup>4</sup> California OES Code for EDD Occupational Employment Project Data. Codes correlate to the craft/skill noted in this table.

**TABLE 5.10-8**

**ESPR CONSTRUCTION STAFFING SCHEDULE**

	Jan 02	Feb 02	Mar 02	Apr 02	May 02	Jun 02	Jul 02	Aug 02	Sep 02	Oct 02	Nov 02	Dec 02	Jan 03	Feb 03	Mar 03	Apr 03	May 03	Jun 03	Jul 03	Aug 03	Total	Average
<b>Month After Construction Mobilization</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
<b>Craft</b>																						
<b>Generating Facility</b>																						
<b>Insulation Workers</b>										5	10	17	19	27	27	25	25	9	8	6	178	9
<b>Boilermakers</b>					8	11	24	26	31	31	31	28	26	24	15	15	5	5	4	4	615	31
<b>Bricklayers and Masons</b>			1	1	3	5	3	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		31	2
<b>Carpenters</b>	12	15	28	40	50	64	39	42	38	34	29	25	25	23	18	15	10	5	5	4	521	26
<b>Electricians</b>	4	4	13	13	24	20	24	34	37	42	47	52	55	52	44	33	26	13	8	6	551	28
<b>Ironworkers</b>	3	8	11	19	24	21	53	36	39	36	33	26	21	15	13	10	10	5	5		388	19
<b>Laborers</b>	16	23	38	48	54	64	37	40	42	39	39	37	37	29	29	21	18	10	8	6	606	60
<b>Millwrights</b>				5	5	12	7	10	14	14	16	13	13	10	10	9	9	4	4	2	157	8
<b>Operating Engineers</b>	4	7	11	9	9	13	13	16	17	18	19	19	19	15	14	12	8	5	3	2	223	11
<b>Plasterers</b>								1	1	3	3	5	4	5	2	2					26	1
<b>Painters</b>								1	1	3	3	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	2	40	2
<b>Pipefitters</b>	4	9	16	20	31	31	40	53	56	87	93	101	102	81	72	30	27	24	15	3	895	45
<b>Sheetmetal Workers</b>									3	5	8	10	10	13	15	16	14	13	5	2	114	6
<b>Sprinklerfitters</b>								1	1	1	1	2	3	5	9	8	8	5	1		45	2
<b>Teamsters</b>	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	36	2

**TABLE 5.10-8  
(CONTINUED)**

	Jan 02	Feb 02	Mar 02	Apr 02	May 02	Jun 02	Jul 02	Aug 02	Sep 02	Oct 02	Nov 02	Dec 02	Jan 03	Feb 03	Mar 03	Apr 03	May 03	Jun 03	Jul 03	Aug 03	Total	Average
<b>Month After Construction Mobilization</b>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20		
<b>Surveyors</b>	2	2	4	7	7	9	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	1	1			71	3.5
<b>Manual Staff Subtotal</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>252</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>345</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>207</b>	<b>168</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4,217</b>	<b>211</b>
<b>Contractor Staff</b>	5	13	24	37	48	48	35	37	45	45	49	49	47	44	41	34	30	13	11	6	661	33
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>306</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>389</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4,878</b>	<b>244</b>
<b>Offsite Pipelines</b>																						
<b>Carpenters</b>										3	3	3									9	3
<b>Electricians</b>											2	2									4	2
<b>Laborers</b>									7	8	8	7									30	7.5
<b>Operating Engineers</b>									2	6	6	2									16	4
<b>Painters</b>												2									2	2
<b>Pipefitters</b>										2	2	2									6	2
<b>Surveyors</b>	2	2					2	2	2	2	2	2									16	2
<b>Teamsters</b>									2	6	6	4									18	4.5
<b>Manual Staff Subtotal</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>					<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>24</b>									<b>101</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Contractor Staff</b>	1	1					1	1	2	4	4	2									16	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>					<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>26</b>									<b>117</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>265</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>349</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>392</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>241</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>4,995</b>	<b>250</b>

**5.10.2.1.2 New Construction.**

**Plant.** Following demolition, plant construction will last approximately 20 months. The construction and startup schedule is based on a double-shift through the site preparation period and the construction of the major equipment foundations and pedestals. This will be followed by a single-shift, 5-day workweek basis. Overtime and additional shift work may be used to maintain or enhance the construction schedule. The number of workers is estimated to be less than 201 for the first four months of construction. In the peak construction month (month 11) there will be an estimated peak of 422 craft and professional personnel for construction of the plant.

Data on available labor by skill for Los Angeles County (the maximum workers and average workers needed for the ESPR) is summarized in Table 5.10-7. The number of workers to be employed each month by craft during construction is provided in Table 5.10-8.

As stated previously, it is expected that most of the construction workers will commute daily two hours or less each way to the project site. Construction laborers are not expected to relocate for the 20-month construction period. Based on the information summarized in Tables 5.10-7 and 5.10-8, there are enough construction workers/laborers available within the Los Angeles study area to meet the demands of project construction.

**Pipelines.** The pipelines would be constructed concurrent with the generating plant. There would be a total of 177 workers during the 8-month construction period and an average of 15 workers. The number of workers is estimated to be less than 3 for the first four months of construction. Peak construction for the offsite pipelines would occur in the 11 month after the Notice to Proceed, when there would be approximately 33 workers.

**5.10.2.1.3 Operations.** There are currently 51 operating personnel working at the plant. Table 5.10-9, summarizes the current and estimated operating personnel for the ESPR during normal plant operation. Two additional employees would be required for the ESPR.

**5.10.2.2 Population**

As indicated in 5.10-7, there is more than an adequate supply of construction workers within Los Angeles County and it is anticipated that all of the construction personnel would be drawn from the communities located in this study area. The project would not require additional non-local workers to relocate to the study area. Therefore, construction of the project would not contribute to an increase to the population of the project area during the 20-month construction period.

**TABLE 5.10-9****ESPR ESTIMATED OPERATING AND  
MAINTENANCE STAFF**

<b>Staff Position</b>	<b>Current Staff</b>	<b>ESPR Staff</b>
Plant Manager	1	1
Operations Manager	1	1
Maintenance/Tech Manager	1	1
Plant Accountant	3	3
Project Specialist	5	5
Administrative Assistant	2	2
Operators	13	13
Shift Supervisors	5	5
Instrument and Electrician Technicians	3	5
Storeroom Utility	2	2
Environmental Specialist	2	2
Maintenance	11	11
Security	2	2
<b>Total Personnel</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>53</b>

All of the operating personnel already live in the study area. The ESPR would require ten additional employees (instrument/electric technician), who are assumed to be hired from the communities located in this study area. Therefore, the operational impacts of the power plant on the population in the study area are not significant.

### **5.10.2.3 Economy/Local Government Finance**

The estimated total capital cost of the proposed project is \$350-400 million. The operations payroll for the proposed project is estimated to be approximately \$1.6 million per year in the first year of operation (2004). The construction payroll for power plant construction is estimated to be \$60-65 million. This estimate excludes payroll taxes and burdens. The estimated cost of materials and supplies for locally purchased materials is estimated to be approximately \$2-3 million for construction, including civil materials and other consumables and \$5-10 million for operation.

The proposed project is expected to provide approximately \$1 to \$3 million in local tax revenues which will be distributed to the City of El Segundo as tax increment revenues.

Project construction would have a temporary, positive impact on the local economic base and fiscal resources through the employment of local and regional workers, and through the purchase of local construction materials.

#### **5.10.2.4 Housing**

The construction workforce would most likely commute daily to the project site. A small percentage of construction workers may choose to commute on a weekly basis. However, there are adequate hotel/motel accommodations available within El Segundo, Manhattan Beach, and Los Angeles as discussed in Section 5.10.1.4. Therefore, construction of the proposed project is not expected to significantly increase the demand for housing in the project area. No impacts to hotels/motels in the area are expected.

There are currently 51 operating personnel at the plant site; one additional employee would be required for the ESPR (refer to Table 5.10-8). As previously discussed, it is anticipated, that this person would be hired from within Los Angeles County and would commute, rather than relocate. If the person does relocate there is an adequate permanent housing available in the study area as indicated in Section 5.10.1.4. Therefore, no impacts to available housing are expected from plant operations.

#### **5.10.2.5 Public Utilities and Emergency Services**

The construction and operation of the project is not expected to create a demand for utilities that cannot be met by local utility providers. As stated in Section 5.10.1.5, there is adequate makeup water, natural gas, electricity, and available landfill space to meet project construction and operations demands. Construction phase water requirements can be met from on-site wells and potable water requirements from contracted bottled water services.

While there is a potential for increased police and fire service calls to the City of El Segundo as a result of project construction and operation, there are adequate medical and emergency response services in the project area as detailed in Section 5.10.1.6. In addition, there are several hospitals within a 10-mile radius of the project site and emergency police/fire response time is estimated to be less than 10 minutes. In general, any increase in public services would be paid through fees negotiated between ESPR and the City of El Segundo. Therefore, construction and operation of the project is not expected to create a significant impact to emergency services.

**5.10.2.6 Schools**

Data for the Los Angeles and El Segundo Unified School Districts within the County was compiled (Tables 5.10-3 and 5.10-4) for this assessment, although because a sufficient labor pool exists within the study area and it is anticipated that construction and operations workers are expected to commute rather than relocate to the project site. Therefore, no impacts to schools are expected due to the proposed project.

**5.10.2.7 Abandonment/Closure**

Planned permanent closure impacts will be incorporated into the facility closure plan and evaluated at the end of the power plant's economic operation.

**5.10.2.8 Environmental Justice**

The primary environmental justice issues for power plant siting and development would be potential air or water emissions that could adversely affect the health of these populations. Other issues include potential residential or business displacements, and EMF or noise impacts on populations near the power plant or transmission line. In general, potential effects associated with project emissions are limited to the immediate area of several miles around the facility and there are no populations (minority, poverty level, or otherwise) in this area of potential effect. The study area for the environmental justice assessment is conservatively limited to the area within 6 miles of the plant site. As evaluated in detail in the Air Quality section (5.2) of the AFC, the Project would not result in significant air emissions of criteria pollutants that could lead to health effects in the project vicinity. It would also not result in significant emissions of toxic air contaminants that could increase the ambient cancer risk or result in non-cancer health effects above established thresholds (Section 5.16). The project would also not involve wastewater discharges that could affect drinking water supplies. Due to mitigation measures included in the project design and/or the absence of sensitive receptors nearby, there would be no significant noise impacts or EMF impacts due to the project. The project would not displace any homes or businesses. In light of this, it is concluded that the project would not result in disproportionate impacts on any low-income or minority populations.

In a recent analysis of the Environmental Justice issue, the CEC has addressed these criteria (minority status and poverty level) even though there was an absence of an affected protected population. In this respect, the CEC has looked for a "high and adverse" environmental or health effect falling disproportionately upon a minority or low income population. Under the analysis for the ESPR, even if a minority or low income population were present, no disproportionate impact can be identified, because as indicated within this application, the effects of the project either pose no significant environmental impact or have been mitigated

to insignificance. Accordingly, even in applying the second step of the EPA screening analysis, no environmental justice issues arise with respect to the ESPR.

#### **5.10.2.9 Cumulative Impacts**

Cumulative impacts were assessed by researching other large-scale construction projects in the project area, where overlapping construction schedules would create a demand for workers that could not be met by labor in the Los Angeles County area. Concurrent construction of the LAX-related projects, Scattergood Generating Station, and the Nueva Azalea Power Project could temporarily deplete certain types of trade labor and equipment. However, these impacts are not considered significant since there is a large supply of construction workers/laborers within Los Angeles County. Similarly, there were no cumulative impacts from the operation phase of the power plant, as the two new permanent personnel would be from the Los Angeles area and would not likely relocate. As a result, there appear to be no cumulative operation impacts on socioeconomics due to the project

#### **5.10.3 Stipulated Conditions**

As a means of cooperating with the CEC and establishing a conciliatory relationship, and an open efficient AFC process that allows the Commission to utilize its resources in the most efficient manner possible, ESPR expresses a willingness to stipulate to and accept the following CEC standard general conditions as promulgated by the CEC that apply to the issue area of socioeconomic resources.

**SOCIO-1: Employment Recruiting Procedures.** Project Owner and its contractors and subcontractors shall recruit employees and procure materials and supplies within the County first unless:

- To do so will violate federal and / or state statutes
- The materials and / or supplies are not available
- Qualified employees for specific jobs or positions are not available
- There is a reasonable basis to hire someone for a specific position from outside the local area, which shall include compliance with negotiated labor agreements.

**Verification:** At least thirty (30) days prior to the start of construction, the project owner shall submit to the California Energy Commission (CEC) Compliance Project Manager (CPM) copies of contractor, subcontractor, and vendor solicitations and guidelines stating hiring and procurement requirements and procedures. In addition, the project owner shall



notify the CEC in each Monthly Compliance Report of the reasons for any planned procurement of materials or hiring outside the local regional area that will occur during the next two months. The CEC and CPM shall review and comment on the submittal as needed.

**SOCIO-2: Statutory School Facility Fees and Funding for Fire Facilities.** The project owner shall pay the statutory school impact development fee as required at the time of filing for the “in-lieu” building permit with the County Department of Engineering and Survey Services and Building Inspection.

**Verification:** The project owner shall provide proof of payment of the statutory development fee in the next Monthly Compliance Report following the payment.

#### **5.10.4 Mitigation Measures**

No significant impacts on socioeconomics were identified; therefore no mitigation measures are proposed.

#### **5.10.5 Applicable Laws, Ordinances, Regulations, and Standards**

##### **5.10.5.1 Federal**

Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations” required the EPA to develop environmental justice strategies. As a result of the Executive Order, the EPA issued guidelines requiring federal agencies and state agencies receiving federal funds to develop strategies to address environmental justice issues (US EPA Final Guidance For Incorporating Environmental Justice Concerns in EPA’s NEPA Compliance Analyses (April 1998)). The agencies are required to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low income populations (ENSR, 2000).

##### **5.10.5.2 State**

California Government Code Section 65995-65997 (amended by SB 50), states that public agencies may not impose fees, charges, or other financial requirements to offset the cost for school facilities. However, the code does include provisions for levies against development projects near schools. The administering agency for implementing school impact fees in the project area is the City of El Segundo, Building and Safety Division. For all developments east of Sepulveda Boulevard, the school impact fees are given to the Centinela Valley Union High School District and the Wiseburn School District. No school impact fees are levied for

development projects west of Sepulveda Boulevard. Since the proposed project site is west of Sepulveda Boulevard, no school impact fees would be imposed on the project (Huerta, 2000).

### 5.10.5.3 Local

The project site is located in the City of El Segundo and would be subject to LORS for that City.

**City of El Segundo Project Impacts Fees.** The cost of infrastructure required to mitigate the effects of new development shall be paid by that new development. Standard project impact fees are as follows for certain discretionary applications: Fire - 14-cents per gross sq. ft.; Police - 11-cents per gross sq. ft.; Library - 3-cents per gross sq. ft. ESPR would pay any applicable project impact fees to the City of El Segundo after project plans are submitted and impact fees are assessed.

Table 5.10-10 summarizes LORS related to socioeconomics and references sections in the AFC that show conformance with the LORS.

**TABLE 5.10-10**  
**LORS APPLICABLE TO SOCIOECONOMICS**

<b>LORS</b>	<b>Applicability</b>	<b>Conformance (section)</b>
<b>Federal</b>		
Executive Order 12898	Agencies are required to identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low income populations	Section 5.10.2.8
<b>State</b>		
Government Code Secs. 65995-65997	Includes provisions for levies against development projects in school districts. The El Segundo School District will implement school impact fees based on new building square footage and project location within the City..	Section 5.10.2.2
<b>Local</b>		
City of El Segundo Project Impact Fees	All development projects are required to pay development fees to cover infrastructure costs.	Section 5.10.2.3

#### 5.10.5.4 Agencies and Agency Contacts

Agencies with jurisdiction to issue applicable permits and/or enforce LORS related to socioeconomics are shown in Table 5.10-11.

**TABLE 5.10-11**  
**AGENCY CONTACTS**

<b>Agency</b>	<b>Contact</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Telephone</b>
El Segundo Community Economic and Development Department	Jim Hansen	Economic Development Coordinator	(310) 322-4670
El Segundo Building and Safety Department	Seimone Jurjis	Building Safety Manager	(310) 524-2345

#### 5.10.5.5 Applicable Permits

There are no applicable permits required related to socioeconomics. However, the proposed project would be reviewed by the El Segundo Unified School District and assessed a school impact fee. Additionally, development impact fees may be assessed by the City of El Segundo once the project development plans are submitted. Table 5.10-12 summarizes the permitting requirements.

**TABLE 5.10-12**  
**APPLICABLE PERMITS**

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Potential Permit Requirements</b>
<b>Federal</b>	
	<i>No permits have been identified.</i>
<b>State</b>	
	<i>No permits have been identified.</i>
<b>Local</b>	
El Segundo Unified School District	School Impact Fees may be assessed once plans have been submitted
City of El Segundo	Development Impact Fees may be assessed once plans have been submitted

#### 5.10.6.6 References

Bellavance, C. 2000. Business Licensing, City of Manhattan Beach Finance Department. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

CACI Marketing Systems, 2000. Demographic Data. Web Site: <http://www.demographics.caci.com/free.html>.

California State Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit. 2000. *Table E-1 City/County Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change, January 1, 1999 and 2000*. Internet Site: <http://www.dof.ca.gov>.

2000. *Table E-4 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1991-1999, with 1990 Census Counts*. Internet Site: <http://www.dof.ca.gov>.

2000. *Table E-5 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 1991-2000, with 1990 Census Counts*. Internet Site: <http://www.dof.ca.gov>.

2000. *Table 2 City/County Population and Housing Estimates, January 1, 2000, with 1990 Census Counts*. Internet Site: <http://www.dof.ca.gov>.

California State Employment Development Department, Labor Market Information Division, Information Services Group. 2000. Web Site: <http://www.calmis.cahwnet.gov>.

2000 County Snapshot. Web Site: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov>.

2000. *Labor Force Data for Sub-County Areas, 1999 Benchmark*. Web Site: <http://www.calmis.ca.gov>.

2000. *Table 6 Occupational Projects Labor Force Data for Sub-County Areas, 1999 Benchmark*. Web Site: <http://www.cahwnet.gov/>.

Chapman, Officer. 2000. City of Manhattan Beach Police Station. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

City of El Segundo, Community, Economic and Development Services. 2000. Population, Housing and General Information. Web Site: <http://www.elsegundo.org/html/forms/population.htm>

City of El Segundo Planning Department, 2000. Fees for Planning Services. Web Site: [http://www.elsegundo.org/html/forms/Fees\\_plan.htm](http://www.elsegundo.org/html/forms/Fees_plan.htm).

1992. General Plan.

City of El Segundo Chamber of Commerce and City of El Segundo. 2000. Zoning Map.

Claritas Inc. 2000. Demographic Report: Census Tracts within a 6-mile Radius of Project Site.

ENSR, 2000. Mountainview Power Plant AFC prepared for Mountain View Power Company, LLC. January 2000.

Hansen, J. 2000. Director of Community and Economic Development. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

Harrington, L. 2000. City of El Segundo Police Department. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

Huerta, E. 2000. Community and Economic Development Department. City of El Segundo. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

Manhattan Beach Fire Department. 2000. Just the Facts. Web Site: <http://www.ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us/fire/facts.html>

Manhattan Beach. 2000. Demographics Profile. Web Site: <http://www.ci.manhattan-beach.ca.us/home/demographics.html>

Sharp, Chief. 2000. City of El Segundo Fire Department. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

Shuck, K. Battalion Chief. City of Manhattan Beach Fire Department. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

South Bay Cities Council of Governments. 2000. Description of the South Bay Cities. Web Site: <http://www.southbaycites.org/sbcities.htm>

United States Census Bureau. 1990 US Census Data. Web Site: <http://venus.census.gov/cdrom/>.

Walsleben, M. 2000. El Segundo High School. Personal Communication with D. Vukovic (URS Corporation).

Adequacy Issue: Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Inadequate \_\_\_\_\_

## DATA ADEQUACY WORKSHEET

Revision No. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Area: **Socioeconomics**

Project: NRG El Segundo AFC

Technical Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Senior: \_\_\_\_\_

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (1)	...provide a discussion of the existing site conditions, the expected direct, indirect and cumulative impacts due to the construction, operation and maintenance of the project, the measures proposed to mitigate adverse environmental impacts of the project, the effectiveness of the proposed measures, and any monitoring plans proposed to verify the effectiveness of the mitigation.	Section 5.10.2 – 5.10.3, Tables 5.10-7, 5.10-8, and Table 5.10-9 pg 5.10-16 through 5.10-24		
Appendix B (g) (7) (A)	A description of the socioeconomic circumstances of the vicinity and region affected by construction and operation of the project. Include:	Section 5.10.1 – 5.10.1.8, Tables 5.10-1, 5.10-3, 5.10-4, 5.10-5, 5.10-6 pg 5.10-1 through 5.10-7 pg 5.10-2 through 5.10-12		
Appendix B (g) (7) (A) (i)	The economic characteristics, including the economic base, fiscal resources, and a list of the applicable local agencies with taxing powers and their most recent and projected revenues;	Section 5.10.1.8, Table 5.10-5, pg 5.10-7		
Appendix B (g) (7) (A) (ii)	The social characteristics, including population and demographic and community trends;	Section 5.10.1.2, and Section 5.10.4.1, Table 5.10-1 pgs 5.10-2 and 5.10-7		
Appendix B (g) (7) (A) (iii)	Existing and projected unemployment rates;	Section 5.10.1.3, Table 5.10-2, pg 5.10-3, pgs 5.10-3 through 5.10-4		
Appendix B (g) (7) (A) (iv)	Availability of skilled workers by craft required for construction and operation of the project;	Table 5.10-7, pg 5.10-17		
Appendix B (g) (7) (A) (v)	Availability of temporary and permanent housing; and	Section 5.10.1.4 pg 5.10-4		

Adequacy Issue: Adequate ☐ Inadequate ☐

## DATA ADEQUACY WORKSHEET

Revision No. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Area: **Socioeconomics**

Project: NRG El Segundo AFC

Technical Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Senior: \_\_\_\_\_

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (7) (A) (vi)	Capacities, existing and expected use levels, and planned expansion of utilities (gas, water and waste) and public services, including fire protection, law enforcement, emergency response, medical facilities, other assessment districts, and school districts. For projects outside metropolitan areas with a population of 500,000 or more, information for each school district shall include current enrollment and yearly expected enrollment by grade level groupings, excluding project-related changes, for the duration of the project construction schedule.	Section 5.10.1.5 Section 5.10.1.6 Section 5.10.1.7 Tables 5.10-3, and 5.10-4 pg 5.10-5 through 5.10-7		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B)	A discussion of the socioeconomic impacts caused by the construction and operation of the project, including:	Section 5.10.2 pg 5.10-16		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (i)	The number of workers to be employed each month by craft during construction and operation;	Table 5.10-8 pg 5.10-18		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (ii)	An estimate of the number and percentage of workers who will commute daily, commute weekly, or relocate in order to work on the project;	Section 5.10.2.2 Table 5.10-7 pg 5.10-20 - 5.10-21		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (iii)	An estimate of the potential population increase caused directly and indirectly by the project;	Section 5.10.2.2 Table 5.10-7 pg 5.10-20 through 5.10-21		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (iv)	The potential impact of population increase on housing during the construction and operations phases;	Section 5.10.2.4 pg 5.10.2 - 4		

Adequacy Issue: Adequate Inadequate

## DATA ADEQUACY WORKSHEET

Revision No. Date

Technical Area: **Socioeconomics**

Project: NRG El Segundo AFC

Technical Staff:

Project Manager:

Docket:

Technical Senior:

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (v)	The potential impacts, including additional costs, on utilities (gas, water and waste) and public services, including fire, law enforcement, emergency response, medical facilities, other assessment districts, and school districts. For projects outside metropolitan areas with a population of 500,000 or more, information on schools shall include project-related enrollment changes by grade level groupings and associated facility and staffing impacts by school district during the construction and operation phases;	Section 5.10.2.5 (Public Utilities and Emergency Services) pg 5.10-22  Section 5.10.2.6 5.10-23  Tables 5.10-3 and 5.10-4, pg 5.10-5		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (vi)	An estimate of applicable school impact fees;	Section 5.10.3 pg 5.10-24		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (vii)	An estimate of the total construction payroll and an estimate of the total operation payroll;	Section 5.10.2.3 pg 5.10-21 through 5.10-22		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (viii)	An estimate of the expenditures for locally purchased materials for the construction and operation phases of the project; and	Section 5.10.2.3 pg 5.10-21 through 5.10-22		
Appendix B (g) (7) (B) (ix)	An estimate of the capital cost of the project of the potential impacts on tax revenues from construction and operation of the project.	Section 5.10.2.3 pg 5.10-21 through 5.10-22		
Appendix B (h) (1) (A)	Tables which identify laws, regulations, ordinances, standards, adopted local, regional, state, and federal land use plans, and permits applicable to the proposed project, and a discussion of the applicability of each. The table or matrix shall explicitly reference pages in the application wherein conformance, with each law or standard during both construction and operation of the facility is discussed;	Table 5.10-10 pg 5.10-27		



Adequacy Issue: Adequate \_\_\_\_\_ Inadequate \_\_\_\_\_

## DATA ADEQUACY WORKSHEET

Revision No. \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Area: **Socioeconomics**

Project: NRG El Segundo AFC

Technical Staff: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

Docket: \_\_\_\_\_

Technical Senior: \_\_\_\_\_

SITING REGULATIONS	INFORMATION	AFC PAGE NUMBER AND SECTION NUMBER	ADEQUATE YES OR NO	INFORMATION REQUIRED TO MAKE AFC CONFORM WITH REGULATIONS
Appendix B (h) (1) (B)	Tables which identify each agency with jurisdiction to issue applicable permits and approvals or to enforce identified laws, regulations, standards, and adopted local, regional, state and federal land use plans, and agencies which would have permit approval or enforcement authority, but for the exclusive authority of the commission to certify sites and related facilities.	Table 5.10-11 pg 5.10-27		
Appendix B (h) (2)	A discussion of the conformity of the project with the requirements listed in subsection (h)(1)(A).	Section 5.10-5 pg 5.10-25 through 5.10-26		
Appendix B (h) (3)	The name, title, phone number, and address, if known, of an official within each agency who will serve as a contact person for the agency.	Table 5.10-11 pg 5.10-27		
Appendix (h) (4)	A schedule indicating when permits outside the authority of the commission will be obtained and the steps the applicant has taken or plans to take to obtain such permits.	Table 5.10-12 pg 5.10-28		